



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,015	08/09/2001	Andrew R. Golding	10984-601001	4152
26161	7590	01/14/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/927,015

Applicant(s)

GOLDING, ANDREW R.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's response filed on 08/13/2004.
2. Claims 9-15 and 24-25 are cancelled (dated on 04/29/2004).
3. Claims 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims and 16 have non-technical language in the body of claims, that is, they are implemented without the use of computer system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 6-8, 16-18 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub. No.: US 2002/0087515 A1 of Swannack et al. (hereinafter Swannack).

With respect to claim 1, Swannack teaches enumerating plausible queries of a target database using query generation rules (user query or keyword or search term/query is generated based on the set of rules, where each rule is defined by user, matching with lookup table and to search a database including of agents: Page 6, section 0086, Page 3, sections 0045-0046); and

generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules (the search results are generating from search engines: Page 2, section 0015-0016, and page 3, section 0040-0045).

With respect to claim 6, Swannack teaches wherein generating further comprises conflict resolution rules (Page 3, sections 0041-0042).

With respect to claim 7, Swannack teaches wherein the target database resides on a server connected to the Internet (Page 2, sections 0038-0039 and Page 3, sections 0045-0046).

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 16, Swannack teaches pre-processing a target database (the target database including agents' information is accessible via the agent administrator and the operation for this database is defined by the monitoring subsystem: (Page 3, sections 0045-0046);

building a mapping from selected queries to associated teasers for the target database (the mapping table is built to map defined agents: Page 7, section 0093);

receiving a user query for target database (the search query or search string is input to search the database storing in the web sever: Page 1, section 10 and Page 3, section 0041, 0042); and

returning an associated teaser if user query matches ones the selected queries (displaying of the search result for viewing: Page 4, section 0056).

With respect to claim 17, Swannack teaches identifying selected queries in conjunction with query-generation rules and generating an associated teaser for each of the selected queries in conjunction with query-matching rules (user query or keyword or search term/query is generated based on the set of rules, where each rule is defined by user, matching with lookup table and to search a database including of agents: Page 6,

Art Unit: 2162

section 0086, Page 3, sections 0045-0046 and the search results are generating from search engines: Page 2, section 0015-0016, and page 3, section 0040-0045).

With respect to claim 18, Swannack teaches wherein building a mapping comprises storing each of the selected queries with the associated teaser (the mapping table is built to map defined agents: Page 7, section 0093).

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claims 1 & 16 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claims 1 & 16 hereinabove.

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-3 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2002/0087515 A1 of Swannack et al. (hereinafter Swannack).in view of US Patent No. 5,918,225 issued to White et al. (hereinafter White).

With respect to claims 2-3, Swannack discloses a method as discussed in claim

1.

Swannack teaches a searching system acting with a search requests to search engines in accordance with terms defined by the theme definitions and the search query is based on the rules defined by user and it match lookup table allowing a user to specify that an argument of a rule and the target database is stored on the web server. Swannack also teaches the displaying of the search result for viewing (Page 4, section 0056). Swannack does not clearly teach storing the enumerated queries and their associated teasers in a lookup table and displaying the teaser.

However, White teaches searching the queries based on the lookup table (see figs. 6A-6C and col. 49, lines 60-67, col. 50, lines 1-16 and col. 52, lines 41-48; also see

abstract) and displaying the result on the screen display device (see figs. 6A and 6B, col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 6, lines 20-28 and col. 7, lines 47-65).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Swannack with the teachings of White, wherein the lookup table provided therein (Swannack's figs. 10 & 11), would incorporate the use of lookup table for storing the user query matching rules, in the same conventional manner as described by White (fig. 6A & 6B). The motivation being reducing the searching time, saving effort and time to produce search results.

With respect to claims 18-23, Swannack teaches a method as discussed in claim 16.

Swannack teaches a specific a searching system acting with a search requests to search engines in accordance with terms defined by the theme definitions and the search query is based on the rules defined by user and it match lookup table allowing a user to specify that an argument of a rule and the target database is stored on the web server. Swannack also teaches the displaying of the search result for viewing (Page 4, section 0056). Swannack does not clearly teach wherein storing comprises placing each of the selected queries with associated teaser in a trie data structure, a hash table, a cache, a lookup table and displaying the associated teaser.

However, White teaches searching the queries based on the lookup table (see figs. 6A-6C and col. 49, lines 60-67, col. 50, lines 1-16 and col. 52, lines 41-48; also see abstract) and displaying the result on the screen display device (see figs. 6A and 6B, col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 6, lines 20-28 and col. 7, lines 47-65); the creation of mapping

for page operations (col. 24, lines 18-30); hash table (col. 26, lines 17-25); a cache (col. 17, lines 51-67) and trie data structure (col. 7, lines 46-65).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Swannack with the teachings of White, wherein the lookup table provided therein (Swannack's figs. 10 & 11), would incorporate the use of lookup table for storing the user query matching rules, in the same conventional manner as described by White (fig. 6A & 6B). The motivation being reducing the searching time, saving effort and time to produce search results.

9. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2002/0087515 A1 of Swannack et al. (hereinafter Swannack) in view of US Patent No. 6,311,194 issued to Sheth et al. (hereinafter Sheth).

With respect to claims 4-5, Swannack discloses a method as discussed in claim 1.

Swannack teaches a specific a searching system acting with a search requests to search engines in accordance with terms defined by the theme definitions and the search query is based on the rules defined by user and it match lookup table allowing a user to specify that an argument of a rule and the target database is stored on the web server. Swannack also teaches the displaying of the search result for viewing (Page 4,

Art Unit: 2162

section 0056). Swannack does not clearly teach wherein the query generation rules are domain specific, and wherein the query matching rules are domain specific.

However, Sheth teaches specific domain knowledge for a set of rules (abstract, col. 8, lines 32-45 and col. 9, lines 38-52).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Swannack with the teachings of White, wherein the lookup table provided therein (Swannack's figs. 10 & 11), would incorporate the use of lookup table for storing the user query matching rules, in the same conventional manner as described by Sheth (col. 8, lines 32-45 and col. 9, lines 38-52). The motivation being reducing the searching time, saving effort and time to produce search results.

Art Unit: 2162

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to (571) 273-4039. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.


Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

McKenna J. Ali
Primary Examiner

ANH LY 
JAN. 10th, 2005